Attachment

CHEVRON AVON FUEL TERMINAL
ETHANOL STORAGE TANK PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - RESPONSES

1. **Land Use and Planning.** Would the proposal:

   a. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? **NO IMPACT**

   The proposed project will not conflict with the project site's current zoning classification, since it involves limited modifications to existing facilities (storage tank) and installation of a limited amount of new equipment (pumps and piping).

   b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? **NO IMPACT**

   The proposed project will not conflict with any environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project.

   c. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? **NO IMPACT**

   The proposed project will not be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity since the vicinity is highly industrialized, and the proposed project consists of limited modifications to existing facilities (storage tank) and installation of a limited amount of new equipment (pumps and piping).

   d. Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses? **NO IMPACT**

   The proposed project will not affect agricultural resources or operations since it will not result in any conflict with existing zoning intended to protect agricultural areas.

   e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? **NO IMPACT**

   The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community) since it consists of limited modifications to existing facilities (storage tank) and installation of a limited amount of new equipment (pumps and piping).

2. **Population and Housing.** Would the proposal:

   a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? **NO IMPACT**

   The proposed project limits modifications to existing facilities (storage tank) and installation of a limited amount of new equipment (pumps and piping), and will have no effect on local population projections.

b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure? **NO IMPACT**

No new housing units are proposed as part of the project, and the proposed modifications to existing facilities and installation of new equipment would not induce any additional population growth, either directly or indirectly.

c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? **NO IMPACT**

No housing units currently exist at the project site, and the proposed modifications to existing facilities and installation of new equipment will not displace any existing housing.

3. **Geologic Problems.** Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

a. Fault rupture? **NO IMPACT**

No evidence of an active fault has been reported on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. The proposed project, modifications to existing facilities and installation of new equipment, will not result in or expose people to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.

b. Seismic ground shaking? **NO IMPACT**

Modifications to existing facilities and installation of new equipment will be required to comply with current best practice engineering and seismic design standards. This will minimize potential damage due to seismic shaking.

c. Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? **NO IMPACT**

Due to the general nature of soils beneath the project site, seismic ground failure, including liquefaction is not likely to occur.

d. Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? **NO IMPACT**

The project site is not located in an area that presents a seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard.

e. Landslides or mud flows? **NO IMPACT**

The project site is flat and will not be at risk for landslides or mudflows.

f. Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not require any changes to existing site topography. A limited amount of site grading may be required, however, this grading is not be expected to result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

g. Subsidence of the land? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project limits modifications to existing facilities (storage tank) and installation of a limited amount of new equipment (pumps and piping), and will not result in subsidence of the land.

h. Expansive soils? **NO IMPACT**

The material at the site is not regarded as expansive soil, and the proposed project will not result in or expose people to risks due to project construction activities on expansive soils.

i. Unique geologic or physical features? **NO IMPACT**

The project site is a highly-developed, industrial area. No unique geologic or physical features have been identified at the site. The proposed project will have no adverse impacts on any known unique geologic or physical feature.

4. Water. Would the proposal result in:

a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will limit modifications to existing facilities (storage tank) and installation of a limited amount of new equipment (pumps and piping), and will not cause changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff.

b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in exposure to people or property to water related hazards such as flooding through any alteration of existing drainage patterns, or through an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff.

c. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in any discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality.

d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in changes in the amount of surface water in any water body.

e. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements since there will be no modification of existing facilities or installation of new equipment in the vicinity of any existing water courses.

f. Change in the quantity of ground waters through direct additions or withdrawals, through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not cause any change in quantity of ground waters since there will be no direct additions or withdrawals, interceptions of aquifers by cuts or excavations, or loss of groundwater recharge capability.

g. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not cause any alteration in the direction or rate of groundwater flow since there will be no direct additions or withdrawals, interceptions of aquifers by cuts or excavations, or loss of groundwater recharge capability.

h. Impacts to groundwater quality? **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

In his May 3, 2002 letter, Mark A. Piersante, R.E.A., provided the District with environmental documentation on spill prevention, hydrology, and water quality at the Chevron Avon Terminal (see Attachment 1). The project site is a fuel terminal located immediately adjacent to the Ultramar refinery, other related fuel terminals, pipeline stations, and industrial facilities. There is known gasoline component contamination beneath the site and surrounding industrial area. Chevron conducts quarterly groundwater monitoring and submits the analytical results to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. A copy of the most recent report was submitted to the District.

Chevron's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (Chevron's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPPP") and Spill Prevention Control & Countermeasures ("SPCC") Plan address runoff at the site. A copy of the SWPPP and SPCC Plan were submitted to the District. In addition, the Avon Terminal is registered and permitted under the State of California's "Statewide General Industrial Activities Storm Water Discharge Permit" program. A copy of the currently effective permit package was also submitted to the District.

"Contact" water (storm water that could come into contact with hydrocarbon or ethanol product) is collected in surface drains, and routed to an oil-water separator. Recovered oil from the separator is pumped to a storage tank, then shipped by tank truck to Chevron's Richmond Refinery for reprocessing. Water from the oil-water separator is pumped through activated carbon to remove benzene and other hydrocarbons, before being discharged into an HDPE-lined evaporation pond.

"Non-contact" water, primarily from the storage tank farm, flows away from the area into an impound basin. In the event there is need to discharge water from the impound basin, it flows through a natural slough to the adjacent refinery's wastewater treatment system, before being discharged.

Chevron's Avon Terminal proposes to convert an existing diesel fuel storage tank to ethanol service. The tank has a double bottom, is in excellent condition, and is suitable for use in ethanol service. There is no increased risk of a spill occurring at the site from tank T-104 since it is an existing tank, and only its contents will change.

Risk of a catastrophic tank failure and subsequent large quantity spill is low. Based on industry statistical data, the expected frequency of a catastrophic tank failure is on the order of one catastrophic failure in 10,000 to 100,000 tank-years. This would reasonably be judged as a "low" or infrequent occurrence. From a process hazards analysis perspective, a determination that the likelihood of an event occurring is "low" (or "unlikely") is the lowest likelihood ranking possible.

A new double bottom and new floating roof were installed in T-104 when the tank was brought up to API 650/653 and Chevron standards in 1998. Chevron believes that, given their usage of best industry practices such as API 650/653, and Chevron-specific standards,

such as use of steel floating roofs and geodesic domes, a catastrophic tank failure will not occur at the Avon Terminal.

New above ground ethanol piping will be installed, and other existing product pipelines that are currently underground will be replaced with new, above ground piping. Risk of a catastrophic pipeline or pump failure and subsequent spill is low.

Groundwater flow direction beneath the Avon Terminal site is in a generally northern direction, towards the adjacent Tesoro Refinery.

The Terminal is located near a petroleum refinery with hydrocarbon contamination beyond the immediate area of the site. There is limited potential for beneficial groundwater usage. The plume beneath the site consists of NAPL (free product) and varying dissolved concentrations of diesel and gasoline range constituents. The NAPL sampled from monitoring wells has been predominantly characterized as weathered crude oil and partially refined product, alkylate. A worst-case ethanol release can impact the pre-existing hydrocarbon plume beneath the site. However, significant impact to the overall condition of groundwater beneath the surrounding refinery is unlikely.

A worst-case ethanol release can impact a pre-existing hydrocarbon plume in three ways:

1. **Mobilize NAPL (free product) that was previously immobile. Ethanol can reduce interfacial tension and mobilize previously immobile NAPL. Evidence for enhanced NAPL mobility would be observed by an increase of NAPL thickness in monitoring wells.**

2. **Increase dissolved phase BTEX concentrations and increase plume length. Cosolvent effects can lead to increased dissolved BTEX concentrations. The presence of ethanol can inhibit BTEX biodegredation.**

3. **Produce elevated methane concentrations in the dissolved and vapor phases. Methane is a product of ethanol biodegradation. Strongly reducing, methanogenic conditions can cause elevated methane concentrations in the groundwater and vapor phases. Soil vapor extraction can be used to mitigate this impact, if necessary.**

In the event of any spill, quick emergency response actions will prevent a spill from reaching groundwater. While quick response is the key to efficient mitigation of a spill, other factors are equally, if not more important than quick response. Chevron's primary measure is the preventive measures that do not allow the spill to happen in the first place. However, in the event of a spill, emergency preparedness and response actions provide for cleanup, and subsequent remediation such as removal of any contaminated soil. Chevron's Spill Prevention, Control & Countermeasures ("SPCC") Plan and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (copies of both provided to the BAAQMD on May 3, 2002) contain additional information on the measures and actions that will minimize the potential for a spill to reach groundwater.

An overall analysis of the Ethanol Blending Project at Chevron's Avon Terminal would conclude that there will be no increase in risk of a spill with potential for impacting surface water or groundwater.

i. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not cause any reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies since there will be no direct additions or withdrawals, interceptions of aquifers by cuts or excavations, or loss of groundwater recharge capability.

5. Air Quality. Would the proposal:

a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

The proposed project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. Modifications to existing facilities and installation of new equipment are subject to BAAQMD permitting requirements and emissions control standards and are expected to comply. The proposed project's estimated maximum VOC emissions are below the BAAQMD significance impact threshold level of 80 pounds/day. The *Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan* is the state-mandated regional air quality plan. This plan contains mobile source, stationary source, and transportation source controls necessary in the region to attain state and federal ozone air quality standards. The proposed project does not conflict with any assumptions used in preparation of the control plan or the implementation of any specific controls. Routine operation of the proposed project is not expected to violate any air quality standard.

Tail-Pipe Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Trucks associated with this project:

On March 15, 2002, the BAAQMD Toxics Evaluation Section completed a health risk screening analysis for increases in tail-pipe emissions from diesel-fueled trucks associated with this project. The maximum health risks were estimated using guideline procedures adopted for use in the Air Toxics Hot Spots (ATHS) Program. The general ATHS Program approach involves using air emissions estimates and dispersion modeling to estimate maximum ambient air concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TACs), and then using these concentrations to estimate an individual's maximum exposure and health risk based on toxicity values adopted by the Cal/EPA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). For diesel-fueled engines, OEHHA has adopted a chronic Reference Exposure Level (REL), and inhalation cancer unit risk factor (URF), which use diesel particulate matter (PM) as a surrogate for all emitted TACs.

A running emission factor of 0.67 g/mile was used to estimate diesel-PM emissions from trucks. This is the emission factor used by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to estimate emissions from diesel-fueled trucks for the highway scenarios evaluated in Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles, CARB, October 2000.

Increased truck activity was assumed to be: (1) 3 ethanol delivery trucks per day, 5 days per week, 52 weeks per year; (2) 1 truck per day for 5 days for mobilization; (3) 2 trucks per week for 7 months for construction, and; (4) 1 truck per day for 5 days for demobilization. Maximum annual average dispersion factors were generated using EPA's ISCST3 dispersion model. Meteorological inputs consisted of sequential on-site surface wind data collected at the Tosco refinery during the Calendar Year 1992.

For this project, the maximum chronic hazard index was estimated to be 4.2E-04. The maximum lifetime cancer risk was estimated to be 0.63 in one million. The health risk associated with the increased diesel-fueled truck traffic is assessed to be not significant.

b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? **NO IMPACT**

Construction and routine operation of the proposed project are not expected to expose any sensitive receptors to pollutants.

c. Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate since there are no greenhouse gas emissions from modified existing facilities or new equipment.

d. Create objectionable odors? **NO IMPACT**

Construction and routine operation of the proposed project are not expected create any objectionable odors.

6. Transportation/Circulation. Would the proposal result in:

a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

The proposed project will cause a limited amount of increased vehicle trips during the construction period. Routine operation of the proposed project will not generate any increase in employment and no additional employee vehicle trips. There will be an increase in the number of tanker truck vehicle trips by 3 trucks/day (5 days/week) to the project site to deliver ethanol. The current maximum number of tanker truck vehicle trips is 18 trucks/day, 7day/week).

b. Hazards from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in hazards from design features or incompatible uses since the project does not involve any modifications to roadways at or in the vicinity of the project site.

c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project site currently has adequate emergency access and allows access to nearby uses as necessary for facility operations. The proposed project will not in any way alter emergency or nearby use access to the site.

d. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? **NO IMPACT**

Workers involved with construction of the proposed project will park their vehicles in existing areas at the project site. There is adequate parking at the project site to support the increase in parking demand during project construction.

e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists since the project site is a secured location with no pedestrian or bicycle access.

f. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? **NO IMPACT**

No aspect of the proposed project will conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

g. Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts? **NO IMPACT**

No aspect of the proposed project will result in rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts since none of these modes of transportation will be used by, or result from, the proposed project.

7. Biological Resources. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a. Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including, but not limited to, plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project site has been extensively developed and does not provide suitable habitat for endangered, threatened, or rare species.

b. Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees)? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project site does not contain any known locally designated species.

c. Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project site does not contain any known locally designated natural communities, and the proposed project will not result in impacts to any locally designated communities.

d. Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands, and the proposed project will not result in impacts to any wetland habitat.

e. Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project is not expected to result in impacts to wildlife dispersal or migration corridors.

8. Energy and Mineral Resources. Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not conflict with any known, adopted energy conservation plans.

b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not use non-renewable resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner since the project is subject to Corporate policy standards for resource use and efficiency.

c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project site contains no known mineral resources. The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State.

9. Hazards. Would the proposal involve:

a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)? **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

The proposed project does involve some risk of an accidental spill of ethanol and a possible subsequent fire. The ethanol storage tank is located inside of a contained area large enough to hold the entire contents of a full tank. The risk of a catastrophic tank spill is very low. The risk of any ethanol spill igniting is also very low.

Chevron's Avon Terminal proposes to convert an existing diesel fuel storage tank to ethanol service. The tank has a double bottom, is in excellent condition, and is suitable for use in ethanol service. There is no increased risk of a spill occurring at the site form tank T-104 since it is an existing tank, and only it's contents will change. Risk of a catastrophic tank failure and subsequent large quantity spill is low.

The worst-case spill may mean different things depending on the context. From strictly a measurement of volume, the worst-case plausible spill is the volume of the largest tank released to the secondary containment area based on a 24-hour period. However, the real consideration for such a spill is how quickly it be mitigated once it occurs, and the elements used to prevent that spill in the first place.

For example, a well-documented 1986 spill into the Martinez dock area by a local refiner resulted from use of external floating roof tanks with roof drains that were inadvertently left open. Chevron's tanks are equipped with geodesic domes that do not require roof drains. This failure mode is therefore completely eliminated, and a worst-case spill cannot occur through an open roof drain. The enclosed Chevron brochure discusses all of the relevant measures utilized at the Avon Terminal. These measures exceed generally accepted industry standards.

Tanks at the Avon Terminal are equipped with a high level alarm (emergency shutdown) which will automatically shut down pumps and stop fill pipeline flow when a pre-determined tank level is reached. The safe working capacity of a tank is generally set at 75-90% of its shell capacity. Tanks are constantly monitored during the filling process. Tanks are also inspected per API 653 by a third-party contractor.

New above ground ethanol piping will be installed, and other existing product pipelines that are currently underground will be replaced with new, above ground piping. Risk of a catastrophic pipeline or pump failure and subsequent spill is low.

Catastrophic failure of piping for terminal piping is extremely low. Most serious failures have occurred with DOT-regulated piping systems. These failures have been caused by third- party impacts, brittle fracture, operations, and corrosion. An extremely conservative estimate of the potential for failure at Avon was estimated by using the API Data "Distribution of Underground Piping Failures by Cause" which aggregate to a total of 0.00024 spills of all kinds per mile-year. Applying this factor to Avon, which has less than

one (1) mile of piping gives a probability of a release of one time every 4000 years. However, this is the probability for any kind of release. The ratio of serious catastrophic releases is about 1/10 to 1/100 of that number. So, the probability of a catastrophic piping failure at Avon is less than one chance in 40,000 years.

Piping systems at the Terminal are designed and operated in such a manner that the risk of product spills is minimized. Aboveground piping systems are inspected daily Monday through Friday for leaks and spills. To reduce corrosion, aboveground piping is painted, and replaced on an as-needed basis. Aboveground piping is protected from vehicular traffic by concrete barriers or poles. Any buried piping that is exposed is inspected for deterioration. If corrosion is found, additional examination is performed, and corrective action taken as necessary. Piping supports are designed in accordance with good engineering practices, and are adequately maintained. To reduce corrosion, piping supports are painted.

An overall analysis of the Ethanol Blending Project at Chevron's Avon Terminal would conclude that there will be no increase in risk of a spill with potential for impacting surface water or groundwater.

b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan? **NO IMPACT**

Construction and routine operation of the proposed project are not expected to result in possible interference with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan since the proposed project is consistent with, and makes only minor changes to, existing operations at the project site.

c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? **NO IMPACT**

Construction and routine operation of the proposed project are not expected to result in creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard.

d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? **NO IMPACT**

Construction and routine operation of the proposed project are not expected to result in exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards.

10. Noise. Would the proposal result in:

a. Increases in existing noise levels? **NO IMPACT**

Construction and routine operation of the proposed project are not expected to result in increases in existing noise levels since there are no significant noise generating activities or operations at the project site.

b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels? **NO IMPACT**

Construction and routine operation of the proposed project are not expected to result in exposure of people to severe noise levels since there are no significant noise generating activities or operations at the project site.

11. Public Services. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

a. Fire protection? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will have no effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered fire protection services since the project is consistent with, and makes only minor changes to, existing operations at the project site. Fire suppression systems at the project site will remain adequate following completion of the project, and is not expected to place additional fire protection services above existing levels.

b. Police protection? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will have no effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered police protection services since the project is consistent with, and makes only minor changes to, existing operations at the project site. Tight security and limited access to the project site will remain adequate following completion of the project, and is not expected to place additional police protection services above existing levels.

c. Schools? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will have no effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered schools since the project is consistent with, and makes only minor changes to, existing operations at the project site and does not involve housing or other public development.

d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will have no effect upon, or result in the need for maintenance of public facilities, including roads since the project is consistent with, and makes only minor changes to, existing operations at the project site. Project construction activities will cause no significant impact to public facilities, including roads. Routine operation of the proposed project is not expected to have an effect on, or result in additional need for, maintenance of public facilities, including roads.

e. Other governmental services? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will have no effect upon, or result in the need for other government services.

12. Utilities. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will slightly increase power consumption at the project site to operate a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) new pumps. The power consumption increase required to operate the new pumps will have negligible effect on current power consumption levels at the project site.

b. Communications systems? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alteration to communications systems since there are no communications systems impacted by the project. Communications systems at the project site will remain adequate following completion of the project.

c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project is not expected to generate any additional wastewater and will not result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alteration to local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities since there are no local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities impacted by the project.

d. Sewer or septic tanks? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alteration to sewer or septic tanks since there will be no change in demand for sewers and there are no septic tanks located at the project site.

e. Storm water drainage? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not increase the amount of impervious surfaces at the project site, and will not result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alteration to the on-site or off-site storm water drainage system since the volume of storm water generated will not change.

f. Solid waste disposal? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alteration to solid waste disposal services since the project will have no effect on the volume of solid waste generated or solid waste requiring disposal.

g. Local or regional water supplies? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alteration to local or regional water supplies since the project will not change the volume of water required at the project site.

13. Aesthetics. Would the proposal:

a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? **NO IMPACT**

No scenic vistas or scenic highways are located at or in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project will not have any adverse affect on a scenic vista or scenic highway.

b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project modifications to existing facilities and installation of new equipment will not alter the visual effect of the facility. The proposed project will not have demonstrable negative aesthetic effect.

c. Create light or glare? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will require a limited amount of additional lighting to provide for safe operations at night. This additional lighting will be located in the tanker truck unloading area. The proposed project will not increase lighting and reflective surfaces to a noticeable

degree since the project site is located in an industrial area and there are no residential uses in the immediate area.

14. Cultural Resources. Would the proposal:

a. Disturb paleontological resources? **NO IMPACT**

No paleontological resources have been identified at the project site, so the proposed project is not expected to disturb any paleontological resources.

b. Disturb archaeological resources? **NO IMPACT**

No archeological resources have been identified at the project site, so the proposed project is not expected to disturb any archeological resources.

c. Affect historical resources? **NO IMPACT**

No historical resources have been identified at the project site, so the proposed project is not expected to disturb any historical resources.

d. Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project does not have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values, since there are no unique ethnic cultural values affected by the project site.

e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? **NO IMPACT**

No religious or sacred uses have been identified within the potential impact area of the proposed project site. The proposed project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.

15. Recreation. Would the proposal:

a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities since the project site does not involve any residential uses.

b. Affect existing recreational opportunities? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not affect existing recreational opportunities since the project site does not involve any recreational uses.

16. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project site does not contain, and the proposed project has no potential to substantially reduce, fish or wildlife habitat. The project site also does not contain, and the proposed project has no potential to substantially reduce, plant or animal communities, rare or endangered plants or animals, or important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project does not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals, since the project will not significantly add to the existing level of development at the project site, and no environmental goals will be impacted.

c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

The proposed project will not cause impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. The proposed project will not significantly add to the existing level of industrial development at, or in the vicinity of, the project site. There are no other known past projects, current projects, or probable future projects to consider.

d. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? **NO IMPACT**

The proposed project will not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.